



*Corp.*, 2011 WL 2118578 at \*2 (E.D. Mo. 2011). “When evaluating whether to grant a motion to reconsider, the Court also has an interest in judicial economy and ensuring respect for the finality of its decisions, values which would be undermined if it were to routinely reconsider its interlocutory orders.” *Id.* Furthermore, even though a court “has the power to revisit prior decisions of its own in any circumstance, it should be loathe to do so in the absence of extraordinary circumstances such as where the initial decision was clearly erroneous and would work a manifest injustice.” *Evans v. Contract Callers, Inc.*, 2012 WL 234653 at \*2 (E.D. Mo. 2012), quoting *Christianson v. Colt Indust. Operating Corp.*, 486 U.S. 800, 817 (1988) (other internal citations and quotations omitted).

Plaintiff’s instant Motion does not meet the requirements of F.R.C.P. 54(b). Plaintiff reiterates facts and arguments that were before the Court in the underlying motions for summary judgment. The facts Plaintiff wishes to emphasize in his Motion additionally do not speak to an argument that the Court misunderstood a party, made a decision outside of the adversarial issues, or would be rendered incorrect because of a controlling or significant change in law since the issues were submitted to the Court. Because Plaintiff’s Motion is an attempt to reargue his cross-motion for summary judgment, the Motion for Reconsideration at hand lacks merit under F.R.C.P. 54(b). The Motion (Doc. 37) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: July 11, 2022

/s/ Douglas Harpool  
**Douglas Harpool**  
**United States District Court**